

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-7, 10-13, 24, 27-30, 33-36, 47 and 51 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 3-7, 10-13, 24, 26-30, 33-36, 47 and 51 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 24, 47 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found on at least pages 38-39 of the present Specification.

Claims 3 and 26 have been cancelled.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-7, 10-13, 24, 26-30, 33-36, 47 and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0050477 naming Robertson et al. as inventors (“Robertson”) in view of Official Notice. After careful consideration of the remarks in the present Office Action, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1, 3-7, 10-13, 24, 26-30, 33-36, 47, and 51, as now amended, are not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Robertson and Office Notice in view of the arguments herein.

As an initial matter, Applicants do not concede by these amendments that the cited art anticipates any of the current or previous claims. Instead, Applicants provide these amendments to progress prosecution. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the unamended claims in the future (e.g., in a continuing application).

Regarding independent Claim 1, nothing in the cited passages of the combination of Robertson and Official Notice disclose (or render obvious):

selecting a first set of records from the one or more databases, wherein
the first set of records are visible to users that have the same
organizational identifier as the first user’s organizational identifier;

selecting a second set of records that are a subset of the first set of records,
wherein
the second set of records match the at least one search category specified
in the search criteria; and
presenting to the first user a third set of records that are a subset of the
second set of records, wherein
the third set of records match the at least one search keyword specified in
the search criteria.

Robertson discloses a system and method for “displaying and managing data in hierarchies and polyarchies of information”. Robertson, paragraph [0010]. The system and method of Robertson further discloses specifying an object having first and second intersecting hierarchies and illustrating the object with respect to the intersecting hierarchies. Robertson, paragraph [0010]. Referring to Figures 4-6 of Robertson, the system and method of Robertson displays the search term “John Doe” with respect to two hierarchies (“business units” and “management”) selected from hierarchy selection area 306. As shown in Figures 5-6 of Robertson, “John Doe” is displayed as the intersection between the two hierarchies.

Referring back to independent Claim 1, the second set of records is a subset of the first set of records and the third set of records is a subset of the second set of records. A “subset” means that the second set of records is completely contained within the first set of records and that the third set of records is completely contained within the second set of records. The combination of Robertson and Official Notice discloses “intersections” of data with respect to two hierarchies, which necessarily means that “John Doe” is a record that contains all the elements of the first hierarchy and the second hierarchy. This means that some records of the first hierarchy are not contained in the second hierarchy and vice versa. Also, there is a clear distinction between merely displaying hierarchies (as disclosed in Robertson) and searching/selecting records, as recited in independent Claim 1.

Page 3 of the present Office Action also states:

Examiner takes Official Notice that the skilled artisan would readily recognize that any user entering a search could in fact search for their own organization or their own name. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have 'John Doe' as the claimed 'first user' where John Doe enters his own name and organization identifiers, as would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill.

Upon closer inspection of the claims, Applicants respectfully assert that the claims do not provide the organizational identifier as being an entered search term as proposed by the present Office Action. The organizational identifier is determined, and then the organizational identifier is used as a search criteria. Neither the cited art nor the Official Notice provide this limitation. Also, the cited art provides for purported entry of an organizational identifier. This is not the claimed determining or searching.


For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the cited sections of Robertson and the Official Notice fail to provide disclosure of all the limitations of Claims 1, 3-7, 10-13, 24, 26-30, 33-36, 47 and 51, as amended, and all claims depending therefrom. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to these claims and an indication of the allowability of the same.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5090.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. Applicant also hereby authorizes that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jonathan N. Geld', is written over the typed name and contact information.

Jonathan N. Geld
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,702
Telephone: (512) 439-5090
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099